

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the above amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the personal interview held August 4, 2011. In combination with the Interview Summary provided by Examiner Dhingra, Applicants' statement of substance of the personal interview is incorporated into the above amendments and following remarks in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-16 are pending in this application. Claims 14 and 15 remain withdrawn from consideration. By this amendment, Claims 1, 9, 10, and 11 are amended; Claim 4 is canceled; and no claims are added herewith. Support for the amendment to Claim 1 can be found at least in Figs. 2, 3, and 5, for example. Support for the amendment to Claim 11 can be found at least in the specification pages 17-18, para. [0040]; and in Fig. 6, for example. Support for the amendments to Claims 9 and 10 is self-evident. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0066536 to Hongoh; Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,955,382 to Yamauchi; Claims 1-7, 9, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over WO 03/105544 to Ishibashi in view of Hongoh and U.S. Patent No. 6,091,045 to Mabuchi; Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishibashi in view of Hongoh, Mabuchi, and U.S. Publication No. 2004/0002221 to O'Donnell; and Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hongoh.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Hongoh, and the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Yamauchi, those rejections are respectfully traversed. In particular, as discussed during the personal interview, neither Hongoh, nor Yamauchi teaches or suggests an eave portion projecting from a sidewall of the process vessel toward an interior of the process vessel that is **separate** from a contact point between the support part and a lower surface of said transmissive window by a predetermined distance or more **on an entire surface in a circumferential direction**, as recited in amended Claim 11.

Instead, Hongoh discusses only a supporting shelf (106) and no eave, and Yamauchi only discusses a box-like shielding portion (32) that does not extend circumferentially. See Hongoh, Fig. 3; and Yamauchi, Figs. 7 and 14. Accordingly, the applied art does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in amended Claim 11. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on one of Hongoh and Yamauchi is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection of independent Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ishibashi in view of Hongoh and Mabuchi, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites, in part:

wherein said transmissive window has, in a center area thereof, a hanging portion made of a same material as a material of said transmissive window, and a gap with a predetermined distance or more is formed between an outer peripheral surface of the hanging portion and a sidewall of said support part,

wherein L/D is equal to 3 or more, where L is a vertical length of the hanging portion and D is the predetermined distance, and

wherein the gap extends over an entirety of the vertical length such that there is a uniform gap width

As discussed during the personal interview, while Fig. 20 of Ishibashi shows a uniform gap width between the hanging portion and the sidewall of the support part, none of

Ishibashi, Hongoh, and Mabuchi teach or suggest the feature that L/D is equal to 3 or more, where L is a vertical length of the hanging portion and D is the predetermined distance. In particular, the applied art is **silent** regarding any result to varying, or optimizing, the ratio of L/D. Moreover, since Hongoh teaches away from a uniform gap width due to the radius of curvature on the supporting shelf, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine Hongoh with Ishibashi to arrive at the claimed features.

Thus, Ishibashi in view of Hongoh and Mabuchi does not teach, suggest, or render obvious all of the features recited in independent Claim 1 or any of the claims depending therefrom. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ishibashi in view of Hongoh and Mabuchi is respectfully requested.

Additionally, O'Donnell does not teach or suggest that L/D is equal to 3 or more, where L is a vertical length of the hanging portion and D is the predetermined distance. As such, O'Donnell does not remedy the deficiencies of Ishibashi in view of Hongoh and Mabuchi, as discussed above. Accordingly, no reasonable combination of Ishibashi, Hongoh, Mabuchi, and O'Donnell would include all the features recited in amended Claim 1 or any of the claims depending therefrom. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Ishibashi in view of Hongoh, Mabuchi, and O'Donnell, is respectfully requested.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, and 16, which depend from Claim 1, and dependent Claims 12 and 13, which depend from Claim 11, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent Claims 1 and 11, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)

Richard L. Allen
Registration No. 64,830